UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,793	03/19/2004	Gregory Howard Milby	NCR 11351	8896
John D. Cowart	7590 03/13/200	EXAMINER		
Teradata Law I		LE, UYEN T		
NCR Corporation 1700 S. Patterson Blvd.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Dayton, OH 45	479-0001	2163		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/13/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/804,793	MILBY, GREGORY HOWARD		
Examiner	A4   1 i.e. ! 4		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	UYEN T. LE	2163	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 January 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the co	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	.001100
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, ,		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12.5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 9-22</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bur because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Uyen T. Le/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2163	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For example, applicant argues that the ADA programming language in Bardin reference is not a database system. In response, the examiner does not equate the ADA programming language with a database system. It is the re-export operation for the ADA programming language described in Bardin that reads on the claimed method. The claimed database system merely corresponds to a system for performing the claimed method, thus was rejected for the same reasons. With regard to the secondary reference Cunningham, applicant seems to argue the terminology "data dictionary" nor present in the Cunningham reference. Note that Cunningham clearly teaches the claimed recording the activated underlying operations for the UDT (see paragraphs 0064, 0070). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any recording medium including a data dictionary for easy look-up.

Continuation of 13. Other: applicant merely canceled a duplicate claim (claim 8) in the AF amendment filed January 18, 2008. Therefore, the amendment has been entered. Rejection to the remaining claims 1-7, 9-22 is maintained as discussed in the final Office action mailed 14 November 2007.